

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES

CRIMINAL ACTION

v.

**LOUIS STILLIS, also known as
“LOU BOP”**

NO. 04-680-03

ORDER

AND NOW, this 14th day of May, 2015, upon consideration of pro se defendant Louis Stillis’ Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence (Document No. 671, filed October 10, 2012); Motion to Amend Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(c) (Document No. 707, filed September 9, 2013); pro se defendant Louis Stillis’ Amended Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Document No. 708, filed September 9, 2013); Government’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, and Correct Sentence Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Document No. 744, filed August 29, 2014); Petitioner’s Reply to Government’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion to Vacate Set Aside. [sic] and Correct Sentence Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Document No. 751, filed November 19, 2014); and a letter from the Government dated June 26, 2013,¹ for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum dated May 14, 2015, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. Pro se defendant’s Motion to Amend Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(c) (Document No. 707) is **GRANTED**;

¹ The Government’s letter dated June 26, 2013 was sent to the Court in response to pro se defendant Louis Stillis’ Motion to Temporarily Stay Proceedings (Document No. 696, filed June 26, 2013), which the Court granted by Order dated June 27, 2013. In that letter, the Government stated that it had “no objection to [Stillis’] request to supplement his motion, as he will only have one opportunity to put forth all of his claims.” A copy of the Government’s letter dated June 26, 2013 shall be docketed by the Deputy Clerk.

2. Pro se defendant's Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence (Document No. 671) is **DISMISSED**;
3. Pro se defendant's Amended Motion Under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Document No. 708) is **DISMISSED** and **DENIED**;
4. Pro se defendant's request for an evidentiary hearing is **DENIED**;
5. A certificate of appealability **WILL NOT ISSUE** on the ground that reasonable jurists would not debate this Court's procedural rulings with respect to pro se defendant's claims or whether he has stated a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Morris v. Horn, 187 F.3d 333, 340 (3d Cir. 1999); 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); and
6. The Clerk of Court shall **MARK** the case **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois
DuBOIS, JAN E., J.